

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated June 26, 2007, claim 22 was allowed. Claims 3, 8-14, 16-19 and 21 were objected to only as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but contain allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 15, 20, and 23 were rejected. Applicants are canceling claims 9, 16, and 23 and amending claims 1, 3, and 15 in this Amendment and Response. These changes do not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objects to claims 3, 8-14, 16-19 and 21 as being dependent from a rejected base claim but indicates the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have rewritten claim 3 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Therefore, claim 3 is now in condition for allowance.

Applicants have furthermore incorporated all the limitations of dependent claim 9 into claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 8 and 10-14 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also now in condition for allowance.

Applicants have furthermore incorporated all the limitations of dependent claim 16 into claim 15. Therefore, independent claim 15 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 17-19 and 21 depend from claim 15 and therefore are also now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the claims.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b) in View of Cheng

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2 4-6, 15, 20 and 23 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,643 to Cheng, et al. This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 23 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection to this claim is now moot. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to now include all the limitations of claim 9, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Therefore, independent claim 1 should now be in condition for allowance. Claim 15 has been amended to now include all the limitations of claim 16, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Therefore independent claim 15 should now be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 4-6 depend from claim 1, and claim 20 depends from claim 15. Therefore, the dependent claims should also now be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to the claims under 35 USC § 102(b).

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-8, 10-15, and 17-22 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference and are now all in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections and objections to the claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Ahmed Sallam

Date: September 24, 2007

By: /Jason E. Amsel/

Jason E. Amsel, Agent of Record
Registration No. 60,650
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)-335-7692
Fax: (650) 938-5200